



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,718	06/14/2006	Magali Rouquie	28944/50020	7056
57726	7590	04/29/2009	EXAMINER	
MILLER, MATTHIAS & HULL ONE NORTH FRANKLIN STREET SUITE 2350 CHICAGO, IL 60606				SKOWRONEK, KARLHEINZ R
1631		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
04/29/2009		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/568,718	ROUQUIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KARLHEINZ R. SKOWRONEK	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 3-11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/26/06</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1-3 have been examined.

Claims 1-3 are rejected.

Claims 4-11 are objected to.

Priority

This application is the National Stage filing under 35 USC 371 of PCT/FR2004/02115, filed on 10 August 2004, and claims priority to earlier application No. 0309983 file in France on 18 August 2003. All the priority documents have been received.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 June 2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

The declaration filed on 15 February 2005 satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.69 and 37 CFR 1.497 in accordance with PCT Rule 4.17(iv).

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is more than 15 lines; it contains legal phraseology; and is not in narrative form. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 4-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-11 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 3 fails to further limit claim 1 or 2 because neither claim recites any biological constituent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3 are directed to a process of modeling and simulating a biological system. The following analysis is taken from the guidance provided in the MPEP at 2104.IV, “Determine Whether the Claimed Invention Complies with 35 USC101”. The claims are directed to processes. Here the claims are directed to the abstract idea of representing the functions of a cell as simulated in a model. The processes do not recite a physical transformation of matter from one state to another. Giving the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation, the claims read on mental steps. In *Comiskey (In re Comiskey*, 84 USPQ2d 1670) the court established that “the application of human intelligence to the solution of practical problems is not

and of itself patentable" (at 1680). In *Comiskey*, the court stated explicitly "mental processes - or processes of human thinking - standing alone are not patentable even if they have a practical application" (at 1679). The court in *Comiskey* stated, "Following the lead of the Supreme Court, this court and our predecessor court have refused to find processes patentable when they merely claimed a mental process standing alone and untied to another category of statutory subject matter even when a practical application was claimed" (at 1680). The court's recent decision in *In re Bilski* confirmed, "a process is patent-eligible under 35 USC 101 if it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus or if it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing" (*In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ at 1391, 2008). In the instant claims, the process is not tied to a class of statutory invention. Output is insignificant post-solution activity and does not represent a significant tie to another category of invention. The court in *Comiskey*, stated "the court rejected the notion that mere recitation of a practical application of an abstract idea makes it patentable, concluding that '[a] competent draftsman could attach some form of post-solution activity to almost any mathematical formula'" citing *Flook* (437 U.S. at 586, 590). The recent decision in *Bilski* confirmed the court's position regarding insignificant pre- or post-solution activity (i.e. insignificant extra-solution activity) as stated in *Comiskey* (see *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008) at p. 1396-1397). Applicant is encouraged to consider the recent BPAI informative decisions *Ex parte Langemyr* (No. 2008-1495 (28 May 2008)) and *Ex parte Biliski* (No. 2002-2257 (26 September 2006)) for further clarification of the above grounds of rejection.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is unclear with respect to the parenthetical phrase "(their activities)" in line 19-20. The parenthetical phrase makes the metes and bounds of the claim indefinite because it is not clear to what the phrase is referring. If applicant intended the phrase to be associated and refer to the phrase "their behavior", an amendment to make the association and reference distinct would be appropriate. Claims 2-3 are also rejected because they depend from claim 1, and thus contain the above issues due to said dependence.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said biological constituent" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thalhammer-Reyero (US PAT 5,930,154).

The claims are directed to a method of modeling and simulating a biological system in which the effects on the function and behavior of the entity relative to changes in morphological, spatial, and temporal occurrences in the biological entity is determined. For the purpose of examination, the term “tangible biological functional entity” is broadly construed to mean any measurable object that has an effect relating to biology.

Thalhammer-Reyero shows a computer based system and method for the simulation and modeling of complex biological systems that are organized into discrete compartments in time and space. Thalhammer-Reyero shows that changes in morphological, spatial, and temporal occurrences affect the function and behavior of the entity (col. 17, line 32-61). Thalhammer-Reyero shows changes are determined recursively (col. col. 35, line 66 to col. 36, line 8). Thalhammer-Reyero shows morphological occurrences that comprise biochemical constituents and transformations representing spatio-temporal constituent behavior (col. 16, line 14-18). Thalhammer-Reyero shows spatial occurrences which are a representation of spatial characteristics of the biological entity (figure 12 and col. 4, line 54-60). Thalhammer-Reyero shows temporal occurrences that are characteristics of the biological entity specifically a period in which the biological entity is active (col. 14, line 47-50).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KARLHEINZ R. SKOWRONEK whose telephone

Art Unit: 1631

number is (571)272-9047. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KARLHEINZ R SKOWRONEK/
Examiner, Art Unit 1631

28 April 2009